Fluor Virginia, Inc.
6767 Forest Hill Avenue, Suite 305
Richmond, Virginia 23225
USA

804.304.6204 tel
804.560.9381 fax

October 10, 2005

Virginia Department of Transportation
Mr. James J. Loftus, PMP
1401 East Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia, 23219

RE: Response to Questions Included in VDOT Letter Dated September 27, 2005

Dear Mr. Loftus:

Following is Fluor-Transurban response to questions outlined in your letter dated September 27, 2005.

Questions for Proposer:

1. ***Treating the three bridges here (George Mason, Rochambeau & Arland Williams) as one facility,***

   a. ***How many vehicles are entering and leaving the District during each peak period?***

      The Fluor-Transurban model shows for the design year 2015 the following forecast peak period volumes:

	AM Peak	PM Peak
Peak Direction	29,000	26,000
Counter Peak Direction	17,000	19,000
Total 2 Way Volumes	46,000	45,000

   b. ***What is the ratio of vehicles entering to those leaving during –***
      i. ***AM Peak Period?***
      ii. ***PM Peak Period***

The Fluor-Transurban model shows for the design year 2015 the following forecast peak period directional splits:

	AM Peak	PM Peak
Peak Direction Split	63%	57%

2. Based on projected volumes, what kind of a backup do you predict during the AM peak period and peak hour?

a. How long in distance?

i. Would the backup be long enough to impede exits to Northern VA?

b. How much delay in time from the point where the back up begins until a vehicle enters DC?

c. How would these backups impact the willingness of LOV drivers to pay for the use of the HOT facility?

Fluor-Transurban has developed a regional strategic model to provide an initial estimate of traffic and revenue for the I-95/395 BRT / HOT Lanes Project. This model provides a high level opportunity to develop design concepts. However, a strategic model has limitations in that it is not intended to be able to accurately model the performance of junctions and complex network terminals. Accordingly, it is not possible to provide at this stage meaningful responses in terms of delays and queue lengths. As set out in the response to Questions 4 and 5 below, Fluor-Transurban's design consultants have assessed the initial operational requirements using standard highway design techniques. That is, the design meets normal requirements of lane balance and provides terminal capacity to match the delivery capacity of the BRT / HOT Lanes on the DC approaches.

Fluor-Transurban agrees that detailed microsimulation modeling is required as the basis of the final design development. This approach is being used very effectively on the Capital Beltway Project and we propose to extend this model to cover the critical sections of the I-95/ 395 Project. This will provide an integrated microsimulation capability for the Capital Beltway and I-95 / 395 including the Springfield Interchange.

The 'willingness to pay' of LOV drivers is a complex matter and will depend on a number of factors. However, the observation that a loss of level of service due to delays on the approaches to DC will impact on whether a driver elects to use the HOT or GP lanes is correct. Accordingly, Fluor-Transurban will be looking to provide certainty in travel time savings to all customers (BRT, HOV and paying LOVs).

3. Based on projected volumes, would there be additional backups within the District to access this facility during the PM peak period and peak hour?

a. How much longer in distance?

b. How much more delay?

c. Would these backups or delays impact the willingness of LOV drivers to pay for the use of the HOT facility?

The BRT / HOT Lane concept developed by Fluor-Transurban increases the effective capacity of departure routes servicing DC. Accordingly, at a macro level, the increase in capacity, assuming on change in the feeder network within DC will result in reduced back ups and lower average delays per vehicle. However, as indicated in our response to Question 2 above, more detailed investigation is required to develop final proposals. Therefore, while at the macro level we are confident that our concepts will provide a material improvement in operational conditions, we realize there is a lot more detailed analysis required to ensure delays and queues are minimized.

In relation to the willingness to pay part of the question, our initial view is that average delays will not be increased and hence there is impact on the value proposition being presented to LOV customers. However, as noted in our response to Question 2c, above, Fluor-Transurban will be looking to provide certainty in travel time savings to all customers (BRT, HOV and paying LOVs). In this way, the benefits of the new configuration will be maximized.

4. What does each proposal assume about non-HOV/HOT vehicles that now enter the Rochambeau Bridge from the Eads Street ramp?

The Fluor Transurban proposal maintains the existing Eads Street northbound ramp onto the Rochambeau Bridge. Two options have been suggested. The first is to designate curb lanes on 14th Street in Washington as HOV lanes, thereby improving traffic flow for HOVs and buses across the Rochambeau Bridge, giving further incentive to ridesharing and transit use. The second option is to make Eads Street northbound ramp HOT/HOV only, in which case the Rochambeau Bridge (at least inbound) would carry only HOT/HOV traffic. This second option is subject to formal agreement between Virginia and the District of Columbia.

a. If the center span is made strictly HOV/HOT lanes, what are the operational implications for general purpose traffic on the other two bridge spans?

If the Rochambeau Bridge is made strictly HOV/HOT, predicated on agreement by DC, current non-HOV/HOT vehicles would: be diverted onto the general purpose lanes; would elect to pay the toll; would choose another mode; or would choose another route.

Diverted traffic could follow Eads Street south to 15th Street, then east to the northbound U.S.1 ramp to the direct connector onto I-395 northbound general purpose lanes. Some traffic may divert onto VA 110 and enter DC via the Memorial Bridge or Key Bridge.

Traffic on the general purpose lanes could be expected to increase until the change in travel time makes carpooling, paying the toll, or switching to transit worthwhile. The economic decision of mode choice is complex. Some drivers on the general purpose lanes may want to use the HOT/HOV lanes. Others will be enticed to use transit, as additional convenient transit service is developed that uses the HOT/HOV lanes. The expansion of the HOT/HOV facility from the current two lanes to three lanes will entice drivers to make choices – transit, carpooling, or paying a toll – that will allow them access to the improved facility.

Two concepts for extending the three lane section across the Rochambeau Bridge are proposed. The first is restriping the bridge for three lanes in each direction, with substandard shoulders. The other option is to use a moveable barrier to institute a reversible lane on the bridge, allowing for three lanes in the peak direction. (The existing barrier would be removed).

Without confining ourselves to the existing configuration and operation of the Rochambeau Bridge:

5. ***How will your proposal interface with the local roadway network in DC? What kind of traffic implications will each proposal have on the DC street network?***

   a. ***If the Rochambeau Bridge is limited to HOV/HOT traffic, what impact will that have on the District traffic during the PM peak hour?***

      See above response to question 4a.

   b. ***Have the two teams considered the structural condition of the Rochambeau Bridge and its two adjoining spans? If so, what are their conclusions?***

      No we haven't reviewed the structural condition of the bridges at this conceptual stage. D.DOT conducts bi-annual inspections of these bridges and at the appropriate time, we will review their condition reports which will include any necessary recommendations for repair and estimates of remaining life.

Financial Evaluation Questions:

1. ***Projected traffic by year, by rate, by time of day, by segment.***

   Please see Attachment A which provides a table with the requested data.

   Fluor-Transurban has prepared forecasts for the I-95 / 395 BRT / HOT Lanes based on the strategic traffic model developed for the Capital Beltway Project. This model uses population and employment forecasts for years of 2015 and 2030 to provide the basis of regional transportation demand and hence traffic volume estimates. Accordingly, along with the calibration model developed for 2005 we have three points of reference for the assessments presented in our project proposal. The forecast traffic for intermediate years can be determined by extrapolation.

2. Explain variation in maintenance and operations costs between concession and tax-exempt model.

The variance between the tax exempt and concession models for operations and maintenance costs relates primarily to the different basis for the traffic forecasts in those two models. The tax exempt traffic forecast reflects assumptions that our traffic consultant, Vollmer, believes can achieve an investment grade debt rating on publicly traded tax exempt debt for the project. The concession traffic forecast reflects the view of Transurban who, as experienced toll road equity investors, believe that traffic and revenue for the Project will be materially higher than forecast using a tax exempt methodology. Transurban has a strong track record in forecasting traffic for their projects, is prepared to invest funds at risk in the Project, and has provided for transit funding to receive priority to any return on its investment.

Assumptions for routine maintenance costs, operations management (also called "project vehicle" costs), and the fixed portion of annual toll collection costs are the same in the concession and tax-exempt models. In addition, both models assume an average cost per transaction of 7.7 cents (escalated annually at an assumed CPI of 3%). The annual variable toll collection costs in each model differ because the underlying number of transactions is different. Under the concession approach, the assumed number of annual transactions is materially higher than under the tax-exempt model and as a result operations costs are also forecast to be higher. In response to this question we conducted a side by side detailed review of the concession and tax exempt financial models. That review revealed some minor data input errors from 2058 through 2067 in the concession model and in the years 2007, 2008 and 2067 in the tax exempt model. Correcting for these errors did not have a material impact on either revenue available for transit or debt service coverage.

3. Break out equity payment from transit payment.

Under the concession approach, the proposed transit subsidy is the upfront concession payment of $251.6 million paid at closing to the Commonwealth Transportation Board. Should receipt of transit funds be preferred over time rather than up front (for example to fund annual transit operating budgets), then the transit subsidy proposed exceeds $1 billion over the contract term, with over $200 million available in the first twenty years. This is based on a $7.5 million payment in 2010, escalating over time at the rate of inflation to protect the real purchasing power of the subsidy. A schedule of transit subsidy payments over time is included below. Any transit subsidy payments over time would be paid prior to debt service or distributions to equity, making receipt of these funds highly certain versus any plan where transit funding is any residual cash flow after all other obligations are met.

Under the tax exempt approach, where Fluor–Transurban is proposing to invest in subordinated debt, a schedule for the potential transit payments totaling over $510 million was provided in Exhibit 3-1 of our Detailed Proposal. These payments would be structured so that they would receive priority to any returns on the Fluor–Transurban investment, making receipt of these funds more certain than a plan where the only transit funding is from any residual cash flow after all other obligations are met.

I-95 – Deferred Concession Payment Analysis		
Assumptions:		**Comments:**
First Year Payment ($ million)	7.5	
Annual Escalation	3%	In line with CPI to preserve real value of transit subsidy over time.
Discount Rate for NPV Analysis	5%	
Results:		
NPV of Transit Funding ($ million)	251.1	Equal to up front concession payment offer from detailed proposal.
Total Transit Funding ($ million)	1,133.8	
Transit Funding – First 20 Years ($ million)	200.7	

Cash Flows Supporting Analysis				
Year	**Transit Funding**		**Year**	**Transit Funding**
2010	7.5		2039	17.6
2011	7.7		2040	18.1
2012	7.9		2041	18.7
2013	8.2		2042	19.2
2014	8.4		2043	19.8
2015	8.7		2044	20.4
2016	8.9		2045	21.0
2017	9.2		2046	21.7
2018	9.5		2047	22.3
2019	9.7		2048	23.0
2020	10.0		2049	23.7
2021	10.3		2050	24.4
2022	10.7		2051	25.1
2023	11.0		2052	25.9
2024	11.3		2053	26.6
2025	11.6		2054	27.4
2026	12.0		2055	28.2
2027	12.3		2056	29.1
2028	12.7		2057	30.0
2029	13.1		2058	30.9
2030	13.5		2059	31.8
2031	13.9		2060	32.7
2032	14.3		2061	33.7
2033	14.7		2062	34.7
2034	15.2		2063	35.8
2035	15.6		2064	36.9
2036	16.1		2065	38.0
2037	16.6		2066	39.1
2038	17.1		2067	40.3

4. ***Revise tax exempt proforma to have principal payments begin at least in same year as any subordinate payment to Fluor-Transurban.***

   To facilitate review of our proposal, we revised the tax-exempt pro forma so that subordinate payments to Fluor-Transurban are deferred until 2013 when amortization of the senior debt is assumed to begin. As noted in the Financial Evaluation, however, this is one of the business issues that will need to be addressed during negotiation of the Comprehensive Agreement.

General Questions:

1. ***How could you guarantee there would always be free HOV Lanes?***

   Please see the provisions of Article 3.1 of Title 33.1 of the Code of Virginia for the provisions of existing Virginia law providing for HOV free in HOT lanes.

2. ***How often are HOT vehicles crowded out by HOV lanes? What experience does your team have with this scenario and has this been experienced on similar HOV/HOT facilities?***

   Fluor-Transurban has developed HOV forecasts for 2015 and 2030 under a range of different background scenarios. These forecasts are based on the strategic model developed for the Capital Beltway Project which has been extended to cover the I-95/395 Project. This model uses the MWCOG Model as a platform but has had more than $1 million of investment and 15 months of development to ensure that it can provide investment grade forecasts for HOV / HOT lane type projects. We therefore have a high level of confidence in the forecasts. For the range of scenarios tested, Fluor-Transurban does not believe that HOVs will 'crowd out' HOT vehicles to a degree where HOT customers will have an uncertain value proposition. The Fluor-Transurban traffic advisers, Vollmer Associates have extensive knowledge of and are retained to provide traffic and revenue advice in relation to the SR91 HOT Lane facility in Los Angeles. Accordingly, our modeling for the I-95/ 395 BRT / HOT Lanes has included the application of knowledge on demand management and trip spreading that has occurred as a result of dynamic pricing of the HOT customers.

3. ***How can your proposal be looked as a whole mobility system?***

   The Fluor-Transurban proposal represents a well developed plan aimed at providing increased transportation services in a critical corridor and a critical region. The key elements that combine to make this plan a mobility solution include:

   A commitment to provide increased transit facilities by supporting the further development of BRT services. This will see the construction of 6 park and ride stops with 3,000 parking spaces;

   An extension of the HOV lanes to south of Route 1 at Fredericksburg providing increased 'slugging' opportunities;

An offer, under a proposed Concession arrangement, to provide either $250 Million in an upfront payment on financial close or $1 billion over the life of the Concession to fund transit services;

An increase in capacity along the I-95/ 395 Corridor to reduce congestion and improve road safety;

A vision for an integrated BRT/ HOT network involving the I-95/395 route with the Capital Beltway to deliver seamless travel for customers; and

The introduction of an advanced driver information system to provide real time access to traffic condition reports and travel advisory services.

In addition, Transurban as a long term partner to VDOT commits to work with the community, stakeholders and the Department to continuously improve transportation safety and efficiency in the corridor.

Sincerely,

Herbert W. Morgan
Executive Sponsor, Fluor

Michael Kulper
Executive Sponsor, Transurban

Attachments:

Attachment A: 2015/2030 Average Weekday Traffic by Time of Day and Segment (2 Pages)

2015 Average Weekday Traffic by Time of Day and Segment on I-95/395 HOT Lanes - BASE CASE

I 95/395 Segment		AM (Northbound)		PM (Southbound)		OFF PEAK (Northbound)		OFF PEAK (Southbound)		TOTAL		
From (North):	To (South):	Toll	Total HOT Traffic	Toll	Total HOT Traffic	Toll	Total HOT Traffic	Toll	Total HOT Traffic	HOT Lane Toll Vol	HOT Lane HOV3+ Vol	Total HOT Traffic
Potomac River	Boundary Drive	$ 0.06	11,500	$ 0.06	9,600	$ 0.03	6,600	$ 0.05	3,900	28,300	3,300	31,600
Boundary Drive	Jefferson Davis Hwy (US 1)	$ 0.13	11,500	$ 0.13	9,600	$ 0.06	6,600	$ 0.10	3,900	28,300	3,300	31,600
Jefferson Davis Hwy (US 1)	Eads St	$ 0.04	10,200	$ 0.04	9,600	$ 0.02	5,600	$ 0.03	3,900	26,400	2,900	29,300
Eads St	Hayes St / Pentagon	$ 0.07	10,400	$ 0.07	8,900	$ 0.03	5,700	$ 0.05	3,100	25,000	3,100	28,100
Hayes St / Pentagon	S. Joyce St	$ 0.09	10,400	$ 0.09	8,300	$ 0.04	5,700	$ 0.07	3,700	25,100	3,000	28,100
S. Joyce St	Washington Blvd	$ 0.10	13,500	$ 0.10	13,300	$ 0.04	10,300	$ 0.08	8,100	41,100	4,100	45,200
Washington Blvd	Arlington Ridge Rd	$ 0.08	13,500	$ 0.08	13,300	$ 0.04	10,300	$ 0.06	8,100	41,100	4,100	45,200
Arlington Ridge Rd	S. Glebe Rd	$ 0.43	13,500	$ 0.43	13,300	$ 0.19	10,300	$ 0.32	8,100	41,100	4,100	45,200
S. Glebe Rd	Shirlington	$ 0.18	13,500	$ 0.18	13,300	$ 0.08	10,300	$ 0.13	8,100	41,100	4,100	45,200
Shirlington	King St (Rt 7)	$ 0.26	12,300	$ 0.26	12,000	$ 0.11	7,500	$ 0.19	6,000	34,200	3,600	37,800
King St (Rt 7)	Seminary Rd	$ 0.29	12,300	$ 0.29	12,000	$ 0.13	7,500	$ 0.22	6,000	34,200	3,600	37,800
Seminary Rd	Duke St / LRT (Rt 236)	$ 0.52	13,600	$ 0.52	12,300	$ 0.23	8,800	$ 0.39	5,000	35,400	4,300	39,700
Duke St / LRT (Rt 236)	Slip Ramps at Turkeycock	$ 0.27	13,600	$ 0.27	12,300	$ 0.12	8,800	$ 0.20	5,000	35,400	4,300	39,700
Slip Ramps at Turkeycock	Edsall Rd	$ 0.27	13,500	$ 0.27	13,100	$ 0.12	9,800	$ 0.20	8,700	40,200	4,900	45,100
Edsall Rd	"Mixing Bowl" (Beltway)	$ 0.29	13,500	$ 0.29	13,100	$ 0.13	9,800	$ 0.22	8,700	40,200	4,900	45,100
"Mixing Bowl" (Beltway)	Franconia Rd (644)	$ 0.29	15,000	$ 0.29	15,000	$ 0.13	15,000	$ 0.22	14,000	49,800	9,200	59,000
Franconia Rd (644)	Franconia-Spfld Pkwy (7900)	$ 0.21	16,800	$ 0.21	13,900	$ 0.09	13,600	$ 0.16	14,400	49,400	9,300	58,700
Franconia-Spfld Pkwy (7900)	Ramps to Loisdale & Backlick	$ 0.30	13,900	$ 0.30	14,200	$ 0.13	7,900	$ 0.23	10,000	39,000	7,000	46,000
Ramps to Loisdale & Backlick	Fairfax Co Pkwy	$ 0.38	14,500	$ 0.38	12,400	$ 0.17	7,800	$ 0.29	3,100	31,000	6,800	37,800
Fairfax Co Pkwy	Slip Ramps near Pohick Rd	$ 0.38	14,500	$ 0.38	12,400	$ 0.17	7,800	$ 0.29	3,100	31,000	6,800	37,800
Slip Ramps near Pohick Rd	Lorton Rd	$ 0.77	13,600	$ 0.77	11,600	$ 0.34	4,000	$ 0.58	2,000	24,600	6,600	31,200
Lorton Rd	Richmond Hwy (US 1)	$ 0.64	13,600	$ 0.64	11,600	$ 0.28	4,000	$ 0.48	2,000	24,600	6,600	31,200
Richmond Hwy (US 1)	Gordon Blvd	$ 0.48	11,700	$ 0.48	9,300	$ 0.21	1,900	$ 0.36	1,700	18,400	6,200	24,600
Gordon Blvd	Prince William Pkwy	$ 0.74	13,300	$ 0.74	12,200	$ 0.32	7,800	$ 0.55	5,000	30,900	7,400	38,300
Prince William Pkwy	Slip Ramps	$ 0.24	10,600	$ 0.24	8,200	$ 0.11	6,800	$ 0.18	3,000	21,900	6,700	28,600
Slip Ramps	Opitz Blvd	$ 0.26	8,100	$ 0.26	6,100	$ 0.11	6,200	$ 0.19	1,900	17,000	5,300	22,300
Opitz Blvd	Dale Blvd	$ 0.21	8,100	$ 0.21	6,100	$ 0.09	6,200	$ 0.16	1,900	17,000	5,300	22,300
Dale Blvd	Slip Ramps	$ 0.61	8,100	$ 0.61	6,100	$ 0.27	6,200	$ 0.46	1,900	17,000	5,300	22,300
Slip Ramps	Dumfries Rd (234)	$ 0.64	4,200	$ 0.64	2,700	$ 0.28	6,100	$ 0.48	1,700	9,600	5,100	14,700
Dumfries Rd (234)	Slip Ramps	$ 0.21	4,200	$ 0.21	2,700	$ 0.09	6,100	$ 0.16	1,700	9,600	5,100	14,700
Slip Ramps	Joplin Rd (619)	$ 0.50	1,100	$ 0.50	1,700	$ 0.22	5,400	$ 0.37	1,800	4,400	5,600	10,000
Joplin Rd (619)	Quantico (USMC) (Russell)	$ 0.70	1,100	$ 0.70	1,700	$ 0.31	5,400	$ 0.53	1,800	4,400	5,600	10,000
Quantico (USMC) (Russell)	Slip Ramps	$ 0.48	1,100	$ 0.48	1,700	$ 0.21	5,400	$ 0.36	1,800	4,400	5,600	10,000
Slip Ramps	Garrisonville Rd (610)	$ 0.80	700	$ 0.80	1,400	$ 0.35	3,000	$ 0.60	1,600	1,500	5,200	6,700
Garrisonville Rd (610)	Courthouse Rd (630)	$ 0.96	900	$ 0.96	1,700	$ 0.42	3,800	$ 0.72	2,000	1,500	6,900	8,400
Courthouse Rd (630)	Slip Ramps	$ 0.90	900	$ 0.90	1,700	$ 0.39	2,500	$ 0.67	2,000	500	6,600	7,100
Slip Ramps	Mountain View Rd (627 - AP)	$ 0.38	800	$ 0.38	1,700	$ 0.17	2,500	$ 0.29	1,900	500	6,400	6,900
Mountain View Rd (627 - AP)	Slip Ramps	$ 0.32	1,100	$ 0.32	1,700	$ 0.14	2,800	$ 0.24	2,000	500	7,100	7,600
Slip Ramps	Warrenton Rd (Rt 17 BUS)	$ 0.54	900	$ 0.54	1,100	$ 0.24	1,600	$ 0.41	1,200	500	4,300	4,800
Warrenton Rd (Rt 17 BUS)	Slip Ramps	$ 0.51	900	$ 0.51	1,100	$ 0.22	1,600	$ 0.38	1,200	500	4,300	4,800
Slip Ramps	Plank Rd (Rt 3)	$ 0.51	700	$ 0.51	900	$ 0.22	1,200	$ 0.38	1,000	500	3,300	3,800
Plank Rd (Rt 3)	Slip Ramps	$ 0.80	700	$ 0.80	900	$ 0.35	1,200	$ 0.60	1,000	500	3,300	3,800
Slip Ramps	Jefferson Davis Hwy (US 1)	$ 0.56	700	$ 0.56	1,400	$ 0.25	1,200	$ 0.42	1,500	500	4,300	4,800
Jefferson Davis Hwy (US 1)	NB HOT lanes Start	$ 0.32	500		0	$ 0.14	800		0	0	1,300	1,300
Total		**$ 17.73**	**369,100**	**$ 17.41**	**337,200**	**$ 7.76**	**269,400**	**$ 13.06**	**178,500**	**928,100**	**226,100**	**1,154,200**

2030 Average Weekday Traffic by Time of Day and Segment on I-95/395 HOT Lanes - BASE CASE

I 95/395 Segment		AM (Northbound)		PM (Southbound)		OFF PEAK (Northbound)		OFF PEAK (Southbound)		TOTAL		
From (North):	To (South):	Toll	Total HOT Traffic	Toll	Total HOT Traffic	Toll	Total HOT Traffic	Toll	Total HOT Traffic	HOT Lane Toll Vol	HOT Lane HOV3+ Vol	Total HOT Traffic
Potomac River	Boundary Drive	sv	12,400	$ 0.10	10,500	$ 0.04	9,200	$ 0.07	5,200	33,600	3,700	37,300
Boundary Drive	Jefferson Davis Hwy (US 1)	$ 0.21	12,400	$ 0.21	10,500	$ 0.09	9,200	$ 0.15	5,200	33,600	3,700	37,300
Jefferson Davis Hwy (US 1)	Eads St	$ 0.07	11,100	$ 0.07	10,500	$ 0.03	7,400	$ 0.05	5,300	31,000	3,300	34,300
Eads St	Hayes St / Pentagon	$ 0.11	11,000	$ 0.11	9,700	$ 0.05	7,700	$ 0.08	4,100	29,000	3,500	32,500
Hayes St / Pentagon	S. Joyce St	$ 0.14	11,000	$ 0.14	8,900	$ 0.06	7,700	$ 0.10	4,700	28,900	3,400	32,300
S. Joyce St	Washington Blvd	$ 0.16	13,600	$ 0.16	13,900	$ 0.07	12,500	$ 0.12	9,300	44,800	4,500	49,300
Washington Blvd	Arlington Ridge Rd	$ 0.13	13,600	$ 0.13	13,900	$ 0.06	12,500	$ 0.09	9,300	44,800	4,500	49,300
Arlington Ridge Rd	S. Glebe Rd	$ 0.68	13,600	$ 0.68	13,900	$ 0.30	12,500	$ 0.50	9,300	44,800	4,500	49,300
S. Glebe Rd	Shirlington	$ 0.28	13,600	$ 0.28	13,900	$ 0.12	12,500	$ 0.20	9,300	44,800	4,500	49,300
Shirlington	King St (Rt 7)	$ 0.41	12,600	$ 0.41	12,800	$ 0.18	9,600	$ 0.30	6,700	37,700	4,000	41,700
King St (Rt 7)	Seminary Rd	$ 0.45	12,600	$ 0.45	12,800	$ 0.20	9,600	$ 0.33	6,700	37,700	4,000	41,700
Seminary Rd	Duke St / LRT (Rt 236)	$ 0.82	12,400	$ 0.82	13,000	$ 0.36	11,100	$ 0.61	6,100	37,900	4,700	42,600
Duke St / LRT (Rt 236)	Slip Ramps at Turkeycock	$ 0.43	12,400	$ 0.43	13,000	$ 0.19	11,100	$ 0.31	6,100	37,900	4,700	42,600
Slip Ramps at Turkeycock	Edsall Rd	$ 0.43	12,300	$ 0.43	13,900	$ 0.19	11,500	$ 0.31	10,000	42,400	5,300	47,700
Edsall Rd	"Mixing Bowl" (Beltway)	$ 0.45	12,300	$ 0.45	13,900	$ 0.20	11,500	$ 0.33	10,000	42,400	5,300	47,700
"Mixing Bowl" (Beltway)	Franconia Rd (644)	$ 0.45	14,000	$ 0.45	15,600	$ 0.20	16,300	$ 0.33	15,000	51,200	9,700	60,900
Franconia Rd (644)	Franconia-Spfld Pkwy (7900)	$ 0.33	15,600	$ 0.33	14,600	$ 0.14	15,500	$ 0.24	14,800	51,000	9,500	60,500
Franconia-Spfld Pkwy (7900)	Ramps to Loisdale & Backlick	$ 0.48	12,800	$ 0.48	14,300	$ 0.21	11,000	$ 0.35	11,400	41,400	8,100	49,500
Ramps to Loisdale & Backlick	Fairfax Co Pkwy	$ 0.60	12,900	$ 0.60	13,000	$ 0.26	11,100	$ 0.44	7,700	36,700	8,000	44,700
Fairfax Co Pkwy	Slip Ramps near Pohick Rd	$ 0.60	12,900	$ 0.60	13,000	$ 0.26	11,100	$ 0.44	7,700	36,700	8,000	44,700
Slip Ramps near Pohick Rd	Lorton Rd	$ 1.20	15,400	$ 1.20	11,900	$ 0.53	6,700	$ 0.89	4,100	30,600	7,500	38,100
Lorton Rd	Richmond Hwy (US 1)	$ 1.00	15,400	$ 1.00	11,900	$ 0.44	6,700	$ 0.74	4,100	30,600	7,500	38,100
Richmond Hwy (US 1)	Gordon Blvd	$ 0.75	13,900	$ 0.75	10,300	$ 0.33	4,800	$ 0.56	3,100	24,900	7,200	32,100
Gordon Blvd	Prince William Pkwy	$ 1.15	15,200	$ 1.15	13,200	$ 0.51	13,400	$ 0.85	9,000	42,500	8,300	50,800
Prince William Pkwy	Slip Ramps	$ 0.38	12,900	$ 0.38	10,200	$ 0.17	11,200	$ 0.28	7,300	33,900	7,700	41,600
Slip Ramps	Opitz Blvd	$ 0.40	10,100	$ 0.40	8,700	$ 0.18	10,700	$ 0.30	6,600	29,600	6,500	36,100
Opitz Blvd	Dale Blvd	$ 0.33	10,100	$ 0.33	8,700	$ 0.14	10,700	$ 0.24	6,600	29,600	6,500	36,100
Dale Blvd	Slip Ramps	$ 0.95	10,100	$ 0.95	8,700	$ 0.42	10,700	$ 0.70	6,600	29,600	6,500	36,100
Slip Ramps	Dumfries Rd (234)	$ 1.00	7,800	$ 1.00	7,000	$ 0.44	10,800	$ 0.74	6,300	25,300	6,600	31,900
Dumfries Rd (234)	Slip Ramps	$ 0.33	7,800	$ 0.33	7,000	$ 0.14	10,800	$ 0.24	6,300	25,300	6,600	31,900
Slip Ramps	Joplin Rd (619)	$ 0.78	5,000	$ 0.78	5,300	$ 0.34	10,100	$ 0.57	6,900	19,800	7,500	27,300
Joplin Rd (619)	Quantico (USMC) (Russell)	$ 1.10	5,000	$ 1.10	5,300	$ 0.48	10,100	$ 0.81	6,900	19,800	7,500	27,300
Quantico (USMC) (Russell)	Slip Ramps	$ 0.75	5,000	$ 0.75	5,300	$ 0.33	10,100	$ 0.56	6,900	19,800	7,500	27,300
Slip Ramps	Garrisonville Rd (610)	$ 1.25	2,800	$ 1.25	3,200	$ 0.55	7,900	$ 0.93	4,200	11,100	7,000	18,100
Garrisonville Rd (610)	Courthouse Rd (630)	$ 1.50	3,100	$ 1.50	2,600	$ 0.66	8,800	$ 1.11	4,200	10,000	8,700	18,700
Courthouse Rd (630)	Slip Ramps	$ 1.40	3,000	$ 1.40	2,600	$ 0.62	8,600	$ 1.04	4,200	10,000	8,400	18,400
Slip Ramps	Mountain View Rd (627 - AP)	$ 0.60	2,300	$ 0.60	2,400	$ 0.26	8,300	$ 0.44	3,900	10,000	6,900	16,900
Mountain View Rd (627 - AP)	Slip Ramps	$ 0.50	5,300	$ 0.50	2,400	$ 0.22	8,900	$ 0.37	3,700	12,100	8,200	20,300
Slip Ramps	Warrenton Rd (Rt 17 BUS)	$ 0.85	5,100	$ 0.85	1,800	$ 0.37	7,500	$ 0.63	2,700	11,500	5,600	17,100
Warrenton Rd (Rt 17 BUS)	Slip Ramps	$ 0.80	5,100	$ 0.80	1,800	$ 0.35	7,500	$ 0.59	2,700	11,500	5,600	17,100
Slip Ramps	Plank Rd (Rt 3)	$ 0.80	4,900	$ 0.80	1,500	$ 0.35	6,300	$ 0.59	2,600	10,500	4,800	15,300
Plank Rd (Rt 3)	Slip Ramps	$ 1.25	4,900	$ 1.25	1,500	$ 0.55	6,300	$ 0.93	2,600	10,500	4,800	15,300
Slip Ramps	Jefferson Davis Hwy (US 1)	$ 0.88	3,400	$ 0.88	1,800	$ 0.39	4,500	$ 0.65	1,800	5,900	5,600	11,500
Jefferson Davis Hwy (US 1)	NB HOT lanes Start	$ 0.50	800		0	$ 0.22	1,100		0	0	1,900	1,900
Total		**$ 27.60**	**429,500**	**$27.20**	**390,700**	**$ 12.19**	**423,100**	**$ 20.13**	**277,200**	**1,252,700**	**267,800**	**1,520,500**